JULY 1953
VOL. II No. 5

# TAXON

*Official News Bulletin of the International Association for Plant Taxonomy, Edited and Published for I.A.P.T. by the International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, 106 Lange Nieuwstraat, Utrecht, Netherlands*

## ON NOMENCLATURE: THE "TYPE-METHOD"

by

LEON CROIZAT (Mérida)

About ten years ago (in Jour. Arnold Arb. 22: 139. 1941; Bull. Torrey Cl. 70: 314. 1943) I acknowledged myself dissatisfied with Art. 18 of the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature, the cornerstone — supposedly — of the "modern type-method" in systematic botany. Much as I wished by then to document my dissatisfaction beyond a cursory expression of opinion, I learned that this was impossible, for a tight web of censorship and backhand suppression made it impossible to reach print on the matter. I am accordingly most happy to find myself today in the position of discussing the subject in the pages of a review, the editors of which see nothing sacrilegious in a frank analysis of nomenclatorial methods and principles. My deepest conviction is that Art. 18 (ed. 3) is nonsense, not only, but marks an epoch in the progressive decadence of nomenclature in our midst. To unmask this Article is much sooner a duty than a pleasure, great as my pleasure may be while so doing. As it is well known, the current Rules largely stem from the practice and philosophy of the two elder De Candolles, whose tradition was upheld up to some twentyfive years ago by their successor, Briquet. Toward the beginning of this century this practice and philosophy came under the fire of transatlantic guns at the hand of taxonomists such as Britton and his associates, who had an obsession with the "Type Method" in the belief, or delusion, that such had never received proper recognition on the European side of the Atlantic. Fired with the same zeal with the "Type-method", today countless followers in the wake of Britton etc. busily strive to fill the pages of our Rules with unadulterated rot. It is sad that the transatlantic hosts are nowadays abetted by large numbers of European botanists who, ill informed as to their own grounds, clamor in behalf of the grounds of others. I am sure that if the latter knew better, the former would also learn something.

The Rules of Nomenclature — let this be stated as it must, forcefully and finally — are a body of law, a code in the truest meaning of the word. In common with every other code, they include general principles and major rulings together with directives intended to assure and to implement their better enforcement. To be conveniently handled, recast or modified, the botanical Rules must be understood in their background and origins and duly grasped as to spirit in the very first. Whatever we propose to graft upon their body, or to prune off their limbs, must be approached in the realization that conflicts involving details against principles, principles against principles, details against details are abhorrent alike. It will never do to fancy that a new "article" or "recommendation" will automatically suit the existing Rules; we must be certain that whatever addition we suggest is compatible with the extant text, in spirit quite as well as in word. Whatever is to go into the Rules, in sum, must agree with their philosophy and their practice, and because of this must first of all be carefully elaborated, both on the whole and in detail, by gentlemen who, being professional botanists are at the same time somewhat less than abysmally ignorant of the rudiments of the law, any law in fact. Those who feel themselves less than competent as jurists should — I believe — stop complaining that they are not "understood" by their better informed colleagues, when pushing forward this or that ludicrous "proposal". They should agree in fairness to everybody concerned to learn instead of teaching. We may not

necessarily agree with everything which the De Candolles saw and put into the Rules, but we can at least respect them and their decisions. This, alas, is far more than we can extend to noisy putterers who, blissfully ignorant of every fundamental, would nevertheless like to step into the De Candolles' very monumental boots.

To return to the "Type-Method": I wager that a huge majority of botanists who worship at the altar of this "method", and are seemingly ready to die hard rather than to allow anything to be done to Art. 18 (ed. 3), have no understanding whatever of what it is all about. One of them, for example (Ewan in Bull. Torrey Cl. 69: 140 *footn.* 1942) would like to have a "Definite name of reference without involving nomenclature", which, if I understand it correctly (and I will always be glad further to discuss the matter), is a contradiction *in terminis*, for a "Name of reference" must be nomenclature. Two authors of supposedly greater weight (Wiegand & Weatherby in Rhodora 39: 298. 1937) believe that the "Object and peculiar virtue" of the "Type Method" is in the putting of names of controversial groups on a definite basis of actual existent herbarium material, which — as it presently will transpire — is a poor belief with little reference to past history and present fact. Benson contributes (in Cact. Succ. Jour. 15: 106. 1943) the following, "Determination of the group to bear the original name is dependent upon the type method described below: Each species or variety is based upon a type specimen designated by the author at the time of the publication of the name, and each genus is based upon a type species. The type plant is the one with which the name is associated permanently and it affords a means of determining exactly what plant the author was naming. Unfortunately the type method is a recent development (the greatest contribution of the American Code), and types were not designated in the earlier literature. However, in most cases a particular specimen (to be considered as the type) or a group of specimens (each a cotype) was cited." Boiled down to essentials, this none too felicituous bit of prose identifies as a great contribution of American thought the citation of a certain specimen in connection with the publication of a new name. This seems to be a very big claim in relation to precious little, for, as Benson himself recognizes, or "cotypes", were even in early non-American literature a particular specimen cited in most cases.

Botanists with a modicum of information do know after all that Linnaeus himself was familiar (Crit. Bot. 125. 1737; Phil. Bot. 197. 1751) with the concept of type-unit (the Linnaean, *Pars typica*), and that even authors so early as Chamisso & Schlechtendahl (in Linnaea 3: 223. 1828) had some understanding of holotype (*Schedula autographa auctoris*). I am not to be expected to retail at length examples of the sort: To conclude, suffice it to mention that the 188 compact pages of the Euphorbieae by Boissier (in DC. Prodr. 15(2). 1862) are doubtless chockfull of cited specimens in relation to new and old names alike. It is accordingly pacific that the tie, *specimen-name*, is a very old one in systematic thought, and that no American ever invented a marvel when insisting, perhaps, upon certain aspects of this interrelation.

Where does the truth lie, then? I should state in answer to this question that the "American Code" (see, for instance its second edition in Bull. Torrey Cl. 34: 267. 1904) contained a whole set of minute, at times pedantic "Canons" directed to tell a botanist how to elect a "type", and putting him in the process into a straightjacket of hard and fast rules. Critically informed European opinion, on the contrary, still inclines to believe with Briquet (in Bull. Herb. Boiss. 5: 770. 1897) that only a monographer could be said to have before himself all the evidence required to settle special, often very involved, issues of typification. If the American viewpoint has some merit, in that it tends to uniform practice in the selection and use of "types", it also has the capital vice of forcing at times a student to choose an awkward "type" in obedience to peremptory fiats that ill apply to specific cases, such cases as are inevitably bound to arise in current taxonomic and systematic practice. The classic European viewpoint is free from this taint, which alone proves that it is far from untenable. At bottom, both viewpoints, cis- and transatlantic, rely upon the same fundamental principle, i.e., that names published in systematic taxonomy, plants' as well as animals', must go back to something tangible, a "type", a principle which nobody ever thought of seriously questioning in Europe as elsewhere. The difference between the two viewpoints in general is accordingly one of practice at the most, about which conciliation never should be difficult in the long run. Brought down to the status

of current Recommendations, the "Canons" of the "American Code" might perhaps serve some purpose, for the very good reason that Recommendations are not mandatory, and discretion, such as pertinently advocated by Briquet, is to decide in the last resort. Erected into hard and fast Rules, these very same "Canons" would often prove quite as obnoxious in critical work as they might be useful in certain general cases.

More or less successful in its insistence upon absolute standardization in regard of typification, the American Code was downright inept in other, vital, phases of botanical endeavor. The notion, for example, voiced in Canon 4 (in op. cit., 169) that the term *variety* should be relegated to horticultural usage, leaving only *subspecies* below the species, repeated an indifferent aspect of current zoological nomenclature, automatically treating every subspecific group as of the same rank and status, which might at times be convenient, perhaps, but does not agree with nature. Moreover, running counter to age-old practice in botany, this notion could only call for stupenduous synonymies and a radical departure from tradition, none of which seems commendable outside of cogent, absolute necessity. As I am presently to show, the high priests of the American Code showed themselves incapable in the handling of elementary typification, so that it is not surprising that they failed to impress their better informed European colleagues in the selfappointed role of prophets of a new nomenclature. I regret that space forbids, for I would most gladly dissect in the light of actual examples — beyond the few ones next to be introduced — the performances of the high priests in question. I openly admit that much as I may respect them in certain regards, still I consider them as ridiculous when nomenclature is concerned.

Further still: The American Code, true to the clouded understanding of its sponsors, made a ghastly confusion in the very concept of type, such confusion that can only be charged to gentlemen whose eagerness was greater by far than critical knowledge; such confusion indeed which through Art. 18 poisons the International Rules of Nomenclature (3rd ed.), as we are next to learn. It is anything but surprising that botanists nurtured in the halls wherein the American Code was cooked do at times convey a faint smell of that grand stew, and contribute on their own, additionally, little dishes of more or less agreeable flavor. *(to be continued)*

---

# Proposals to amend the Stockholm Code of Botanical Nomenclature.

**Proposal no. 11 submitted to the Paris Congress**

by

F. R. Fosberg (Falls Church, Va.)

The new International Code of Botanical Nomenclature, adopted at the Stockholm Congress and published as Regnum Vegetabile, 3: 1-228. 1952 seems unquestionably the most satisfactory document of its kind ever produced. As a result of the careful preparations before the Congress, the thoughtful and critical consideration of all accumulated proposals by the Nomenclature Section of the Congress, and the effective labors of the Editorial Committee, an essentially workable scheme of rules has been created. And it comes fairly close to satisfying the principle embodied in Article 3 that "The Code of nomenclature should be simple and founded on considerations sufficiently clear and forcible for everyone to comprehend and be disposed to accept."

As yet there has not been sufficient time since the publication of this code for it to be thoroughly tested by application to the full range of nomenclatural problems to which it must provide solutions. There is little doubt that situations may arise that were not anticipated and that may require modification of certain wordings and provisions. During a careful reading and a certain amount of application a few such defects, inadequacies or ambiguities have come to light. In order that these may be given ample thought before they are considered at the Paris Congress in 1954, they are here pointed out with some discussion and proposals for amendment of certain articles. These are mostly very minor matters, but ones which occasionally may cause trouble. Some of them have already given trouble during consideration of certain generic names proposed for conservation. These proposals are here made in the

numerical order of the articles to which they apply.

**Page 17**

**Article 18 Note 3.** On line 2 substitute "may" for "must", and add to this sentence "unless the name or epithet is a *nomen dubium* (see [new] Art. 75 p. [41].

As this stands now it is mandatory to choose a type whether or not any good purpose will be served thereby. There are many taxa, especially older ones, which are so vaguely or imperfectly described that there is no possibility of knowing what the author had in mind and any subsequent typification must be arbitrary. And since, by the following sentence, the first typification must be followed unless it can be shown not to be in accord with the description, much mischief might result from ill-considered typification which could not easily be reserved. In considering certain generic names proposed for rejection, the Special Committee for Phanerogams and Pteridophytes has run into a number of such cases in trying to satisfy the requirement that the application of rejected names is determined by types. With certain earlier homonyms it is impossible to have any clear idea of what their authors had in mind. (In articles 62 and 63, however, a similar substitution should not be made, as these are to cover cases where genera and species are subdivided, and when this is done typification seems essential.) To take care of these cases a provision for Nomina Dubia should be reinstated in the Code. The deletion of Article 63 at Stockholm was definitely a mistake. There is no doubt that most careful taxonomists will prefer to place a name in this category unless they can form a reasonably clear idea of what an author had in mind, or unless typification is necessary to preserve established usage. Adoption of this proposal will also make it unnecessary to typify names in order to use them in accord with the rules in floristic lists and relatively casual papers. The typification of any name should only be done after ample study to enable one to be thoroughly familiar with the facts.

**Page 19**

**Article 23.** After the last paragraph and before the Example insert a paragraph as follows:

"For purposes of homonymy only, valid publication of names of genera in all groups of plants, recent and fossil, begins with May 1, 1753."

This is necessary as it may be a matter of opinion to which group an organism belongs, and therefore at what date its name becomes validly published and consequently invalidates later homonyms. A person concerned with a later homonym of such a name may not necessarily be competent to have an opinion on the proper position of the earlier homonym, and in any event, such uncertainty is not conductive to stability. In matters such as this, where names in other groups of plants are involved, the starting date should be on a more objective basis than opinion as to taxonomic relationship. This is well recognized in the last two lines of Article 6, where "if an organism is transferred from the plant to the animal kingdom, its names retain their status in botanical nomenclature."

**Page 25**

**Article 35.** Add to the first sentence "except that the name of the original author of the epithet may, if desired, be added in parentheses".

This is desirable to facilitate precision when, as permitted by Art. 34, complicated names are reduced to ternary combinations. It will also tend to add precision when, as is done by many workers, the author of the specific epithet is omitted when an infraspecific epithet is added to a name, as in writing labels, making floristic lists, etc.

**Page 26**

**Article 39.** Add to the second sentence "typescripts or other unpublished material".

This is desirable to avoid technicalities such as the suggestion that "manuscript" applies only to handwritten material.

**Page 34**

**Recommendation 60F.** In Examples, add "e.g." after Vahl.

The present reading is confusing, as it is not clear whether the authors following Vahl in the list are those who have used the name correctly or those who have misused it.

**Page 40**

**Article 73.** In case (1) delete "one or more of", leaving it to read "under the rules".

A name or epithet cannot be "adopted under one or more of the rules". It either must be adopted under all of the rules or

it is illegitimate and must be rejected. (See Art. 10).

**Page 41**

**Article 74.** In third paragraph of article change "taxa" to "plant groups".

This seems to be an improper use of the term "taxon" as it is not clear that the object is to require consideration of names of cryptogams and fossils by phanerogamic botanists and *vice versa*. A similar, but correct use may be found in Article 23, first sentence.

**Article 75.** Delete this article and its examples and replace them with the following; "A name must be rejected when it was not typified by its author and its description is both unaccompanied by cited material or cited earlier identifiable synonyms or descriptions and is so vague and incomplete that it is impossible to know what the author had in mind so as to be able to typify it (Nomina dubia)."

"Examples: *Nemelaia laurina* Raf. Aut. Bot. 144-145, 1840 (genus and species unplaced, even as to family); *Baranda angatensis Llanos,* Mem. Acad. Cienc. Madr. 2: 502, 1859 (genus and species of wholly uncertain identity); *Cephalanthus procumbens* Lour. Fl. Coch. 67, 1790 (species of wholly uncertain status, probably not a *Cephalanthus*); *Ixora novemnervia* Lour. Fl. Coch. 76, 1790 (species of uncertain status, probably not an *Ixora*); *Convolvulus bufalinus* Lour. Fl. Coch. 109, 1790 (species unidentified, possibly an *Ipomoea* or *Merremia* rather than a *Convolvulus*)."

It is impossible to apply Article 75 objectively and consistently as it stands. There is no probability that different workers will have the same opinion about which names have become long-persistent sources of error or to which names this article should apply. It seems to provide a fertile source of difference of practice and to contribute, potentially, more to instability of nomenclature than does the evil that it seeks to correct. No name, if it can be satisfactorily typified, in accordance with Articles 18 and 19 and Appendix I, need continue to be a source of error.

On the other hand, there must be some method of dealing with names whose authors have accompanied them neither with cited material nor references to previously published descriptions and whose own descriptions do not permit selection of types with any confidence. Arbitrary typification, in such cases, is meaningless, and will certainly give rise to endless disagreement. It was an ill-considered step, at Stockholm, to eliminate Article 63, and this proposal restores it, but with clarification.

**Article 77.** Delete this article and its examples.

It is clearly impossible to define a monstrosity or to say how far a plant must deviate from the other members of its species before it is to be regarded as teratological. This article is neither practical to apply nor is it in any way necessary or even desirable. Even though a plant is regarded as a monstrosity it is usually possible to know to what species it belongs. If this is so, and the species has a name, the name based on the monstrosity becomes a synonym. If it is the earliest name for a species or other taxon, so long as the plant is identifiable there is no objection to using it. If it is not identifiable it can be applied only to its type specimen, and consequently has no significance. So there seems no point to this article and it is very likely to cause much confusion in its application, as different botanists will inevitably have different views on monstrosities.

**Page 83**

**New Article 84,** constituting a new **Section 17,** to be added as follows: "Section 17. Amendment of the Code of Nomenclature.

"Article 84. Proposals for the amendment of the Code or for additions to the lists of Nomina Conservanda must be published and available to botanists at least one year before the International Botanical Congress at which they are to be considered. At the subsequent International Botanical Congress such proposals must be voted upon by the Nomenclature Section, and if adopted or modified and adopted by a majority must then be submitted to a plenary session of the Congress for approval.

"Note. Directions and requirements for publication and submission of such proposals are contained in Appendix VII."

There has already been some confusion about the requirements for proposals, and the excuse that there is nothing in the rules on publication of proposals has been given to justify informality and irregularity on such matters. Any such document should contain provisions for its amendment.

# Propositions pour le Congrès de Paris

**Proposition n. 12**

Proposition pour l'adjonction de l'article suivant:

**Article 78 bis**

Les épithètes subdivisionnaires des subdivisions de genres sont illégitimes et doivent être rejetées dans les cas spéciaux suivants:

(1) Lorsque, formées par adjonction du préfixe *eu-* au nom du genre ou à l'épithète subdivisionnaire d'une subdivision supérieure, elles ne contiennent pas l'espèce type du genre ou de la subdivision supérieure.

(2) Lorsqu'elles sont formées de la même manière et que le nom du genre ou l'épithète subdivisionnaire de la subdivision supérieure viennent à être modifiés.

(3) Lorsque, portant le nom d'un genre ou l'épithète d'une subdivision supérieure dont le rang hiérarchique a été abaissé, elles ne contiennent pas le type de ce genre ou de cette subdivision supérieure.

Exemples: (1) L'espèce type du genre *Baissea* A.DC. étant *Baissea multiflora* A. DC., l'épithète subdivisionnaire *Baissea* sect. *Eubaissea* K. Sch. (in Engl. et Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. 4 (2): 172. 1895) est illégitime parce que *Baissea multiflora* A.DC n'appartient pas à cette section, mais à la section *Afrobaissea* K.Sch. — L'espèce type du genre *Bromus* L. étant *Bromus secalinus* L., les épithètes subdivisionnaires *Bromus* sect. *Eubromus* Godr. (in Gren. et Godr., Fl. Fr. III. 582. 1856) et *Bromus* subg. *Eubromus* (Godr.) Rouy (Fl. Fr., XIV. 246. 1913) sont illégitimes parce que *Bromus secalinus* L. n'appartient pas à cette section ou à ce sous-genre, mais à la section *Bromium* Dumort. ou au sous-genre *Zeobromus* (Griseb.) Hackel.

(2) L'épithète subdivisionnaire Sect. *Euzygodia* Stapf (in Dyer, Fl. Trop. Afr. 4(1): 217. 1902), qui serait légitime pour une subdivision du genre *Zygodia* Benth., devient illégitime quand on considère le genre *Zygodia* Benth. comme synonyme du genre *Baissea* A.DC.

(3) Le genre *Guerkea* K.Sch. (in Engl. et Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. 4(2): 180. 1895), qui a pour espèce type *Guerkea floribunda* K.Sch., est aujourd'hui considéré comme synonyme du genre *Baissea* A.DC.; mais l'épithète subdivisionnaire *Baissea* sect. *Guerkea* (K.Sch.) Stapf (in Dyer, Fl. Trop. Afr. 4(1): 205. 1902) est illégitime parce que *Guerkea floribunda* K.Sch. n'appartient pas à cette section, mais à la section *Afrobaissea* K.Sch. — Le genre *Lactaria* Raf. (Sylva Tell. 162. 1838), qui a pour espèce type *Lactaria salubris* Raf., est aujourd'hui considéré comme synonyme du genre *Ochrosia* Juss.; mais l'épithète subdivisionnaire *Ochrosia* sect. *Lactaria* (Raf.) F. Muell. (Fragm. VII. 130. 1869-71) est illégitime parce que *Lactaria salubris* Raf. n'appartient pas à cette section, mais à la section *Echinocaryon* F. Muell.

Proposé par: M. Pichon, Paris.

Publication originale: Bull. Mus. Nat. Hist. Nat., 2e sér. XXI. 393-394. 1949, sous une forme un peu différente.

**Proposition n. 13**

Proposition pour les modifications suivantes à la liste des **Nomina Familiarum Conservanda**:

Clusiaceae: à la suite de „ne comprenant pas Hypericum L.", ajouter „Alt.: Guttiferae".

Guttiferae: à la place de „(Voir Hypericaceae)", lire „(Voir Clusiaceae)".

Hypericaceae: à la suite de „Alt.: Guttiferae", ajouter „si la famille comprend Clusia L."

Commentaires: Le genre type de la famille des *Guttiferae* n'est pas *Hypericum* L., mais *Clusia* L. Chaque fois que les genres *Clusia* et *Hypericum* ont été maintenus dans deux familles distinctes, le terme *Guttiferae* a été appliqué à la famille contenant le genre *Clusia*. Exemples: A.DC., in DC., Prodr. 1: 557 (1824); Benth. et Hook. f., Gen. Pl. 1 (1): 167 (1862); J. Vesque, in A.DC. et C.DC., Monogr. Phan. 8 (1893).

Proposé par: M. Pichon, Paris.

**Proposition n. 14**

Proposition pour les corrections suivantes dans la liste des **Nomina Generica Conservanda**:

**6564. Willughbeia** Roxb. Dans les *nomina rejicienda*, remplacer *Ancylocladus* par *Ancylocladus*.

**6632. Thevetia** Adans. Remplacer „T.: *T. ahouai* (L.) DC." par „T.: *T. nereifolia* Juss. ex Steud."

Commentaires: Adanson (Fam. 2: 171. 1763) admet côte à côte les deux genres *Thevetia* et *Ahouai*. Ce dernier étant fondé sur *Cerbera Ahouai* L. = *Thevetia Ahouai* (L.) A.DC., cette espèce ne peut pas être prise pour type du genre *Thevetia*. Le type du genre *Thevetia* est évidemment T. *nereifolia* Juss. ex Steud., fondé sur *Cerbera*

*Thevetia* L., et synonyme de T. *peruviana* (Pers.) K.Sch.

Proposé par: M. Pichon, Paris.

**Proposition n. 15**

Proposition pour la conservation du genre *Hunteria* (Apocynacées):

**6614. Hunteria** Roxb., Hort. Beng. 84 (1814), nom. nud., et Fl. Ind., ed. Carey et Wall., 2: 531 (1824), cum descr., *versus*: *Apocyno-Nerium* L., Fl. Zeyl. 191 (1747).

*Hunteria* Roxb. *Apocynaceae.*

Adopté par: Endl., Gen. Pl. 581 (1837); A.DC., in DC., Prodr. 8: 349 (1844); Benth. et Hook. f., Gen. Pl. 2 (2): 698 (1876); Watt, Dict. Econom. Prod. Ind. 4: 307 (1890); K. Sch., in Engl. et Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. 4 (2): 150 (1895); Dalla Torre et Harms, Gen. Siph. 1: 407 (1904); Hall.f., in Jahrb. Hamb. Wiss. Anst. 17 (3. Beih.): 187 (1900); Pichon, in Mém. Mus. Nat. Hist. Nat., n. sér. 24: 160 (1948); Hook., Fl. Brit. Ind. 3: 637 (1882); Trimen, Hand-book Fl. Ceylon 3: 127 (1895); Boerl., Fl. Ned. Ind. 2 (2): 359 (1899); Brandis, Ind. Trees 457 (1906); Ridl., Fl. Mal. Pen. 2: 335 (1923); Gamble, Fl. Presid. Madras 2: 808 (1923); Pitard, in Lecomte, Fl. Indo-Ch. 3: 1129 (1933); Kerr, in Craib, Fl. Siam. Enum. 2 (5): 434 (1939). *Six* espèces, d'Afrique et d'Asie tropicales et de Sumatra.

Espèce type: *H. corymbosa* Roxb., synonyme de *H. zeylanica* (Retz.) Gardn. ex Thw., qui a pour basinyme *Cameraria zeylanica* Retz.

*Apocyno-Nerium* L. *Apocynaceae.*

Délaissé par tous les auteurs.

Type non désigné.

Commentaires: Aucune combinaison binominale n'a été faite sur *Apocyno-Nerium*, nom qui est complètement tombé en désuétude.

Proposé par: M. Pichon, Paris.

**Proposition n. 16**

Proposition pour la conservation du genre *Kopsia* (Apocynacées):

**6626. Kopsia** Bl., Cat. Gew. Buitenz. 12 (1823), non *Kopsia* Dumort., Comm. Bot. 16 (1822) *versus: Calpicarpum* G. Don, Gen. Syst. 4: 100 (1837).

*Kopsia* Bl. *Apocynaceae.*

Adopté par: Endl., Gen. Pl. 580 (1837); A.DC., in DC., Prodr. 8: 351 (1844); Benth. et Hook.f., Gen. Pl. 2 (2): 701 (1876); K. Sch., in Engl. et Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. 4 (2): 156 (1895); Dalla Torre et Harms, Gen. Siph. 1: 407 (1904); Pichon, in Mém. Mus. Nat. Hist. Nat., n. sér. 27: 171 (1948); Hooker, Fl. Brit. Ind. 3: 639 (1882); Boerl., Fl. Ned. Ind. 2 (2): 363 (1899); Brandis, Ind. Trees 458 (1906); Merrill, in Roy. As. Soc. Journ., Spec. Numb. 500 (1921); Merrill, Enum. Phil. Fl. Pl. 3: 330 (1923); Ridl., Fl. Mal. Pen. 2: 336 (1923); Pitard, in Lecomte, Fl. Indo-Ch. 3: 1132 (1933); Kerr, in Craib, Fl. Siam. Enum. 2 (5): 437 (1939); Bakh. v. d. Brink, in Fl. Java, Apocynaceae, 27 (1948). *Vingt-huit* espèces, du S.E. de l'Asie et de l'Insulinde.

Espèce type: *K. arborea* Bl.

*Kopsia* Dumort. *Orobanchaceae.*

Universellement réduit en synonymie d'*Orobanche* L. Cf. G. Beck-Mannagetta, in Engl., Pflanzenreich 4 (261): 61 (1930).

Espèces syntypes: *K. ramosa* (L.) Dumort., *K. arenaria* (Bieb.) Dumort., *K. caerulea* (Vill.) Dumort., *K. interrupta* (Pers.) Dumort. et *K. longiflora* (Pers.) Dumort.

*Calpicarpum* G. Don *Apocynaceae.*

Délaissé par tous les auteurs.

Espèces syntypes: *C. Roxburghii* G. Don, synonyme de *Kopsia fruticosa* (Roxb. ex Edwards) A.DC., et *C. Lamarkii* G. Don, synonyme d'*Ochrosia oppositifolia* (Lamk.) K.Sch.

Commentaires: L'adoption de *Calpicarpum* prêterait à confusion, puisque les deux espèces originales appartiennent à deux genres différents, et nécessiterait la création de 28 combinaisons nouvelles.

Proposé par: M. Pichon, Paris.

Publication originale: Mém. Mus. Nat. Hist. Nat., n. sér. 27: 172 (1948), sous une forme moins développée.

**Proposition n. 17**

Proposition pour la conservation du genre *Catalpa* (Bignoniacées):

**7727. Catalpa** Scop., Introd. 170 (1777) *versus: Cumbulu* Adans., Fam. 2: 199 (1763).

*Catalpa* Scop. *Bignoniaceae.*

Universellement adopté. Cf. J. Paclt, in Candollea 13: 241-285 (1952), avec bibliographie. *Onze* espèces, de la Chine, des Etats-Unis et des Grandes-Antilles.

Espèce type: *Catalpa bignonioides* Walt., fondée sur *Bignonia Catalpa* L.

*Cumbulu* Adans. *Bignoniaceae.*

Délaissé par tous les auteurs.

Type non désigné.

Commentaires: superflus, tant *Catalpa* est connu de tous.

Proposé par: M. Pichon, Paris.

**Proposition n. 18**

Proposition pour la modification suivante:

**Appendice VI, paragraphe (3)**

Après „on devrait omettre les articles, prépositions et autres particules (der, the, of, de, et .... etc.)", ajouter „sauf quand cette omission peut créer une confusion".

Aux exemples, ajouter „— Journ. de Bot. (Journal de Botanique) et Journ. of Bot. (Journal of Botany), non Journ. Bot."

Proposé par: M. Pichon, Paris.

**Proposal no. 19**

Proposal for the conservation of the genus **Manilkara** of the Sapotaceae: *Manilkara* Adanson, Fam. Pl. 2: 166. 1763 *versus*: *Achras* Linnaeus, Spec. Pl. 1190. 1753.

*Manilkara* Adanson, Sapotaceae.

Adopted by: Dubard, Ann. Mus. col. Mars. 23: 6. 1912; H. J. Lam, Bull. Jard. bot. Bzg, sér. 3, 8: 238. 1925; idem, Bull. Jard. bot. Bzg, sér. 3, 8: 481. 1927; idem, Blumea 4, 2: 323. 1941; idem, Blumea 5, 1, 41. 1942; Gilly, Tropical Woods 73: 1. 1943. About 75 species scattered over the tropical parts of America, Africa and Asia.

Type species: *Manilkara kauki* (L.) Dubard (1912), based on Mimusops kauki L. (1753).

*Achras* Linnaeus. Sapotaceae.

Adopted by: Loefling, Iter Hisp.: 186. 1758; Engler, Engler & Prantl, Nat. Pfl. Fam. 4, 1: 137. 1897; H. J. Lam, l.c.: 218. 1925; idem, l.c.: 476. 1927; Baehni, Candollea 7: 416. 1938; Little jr, Brittonia 7: 48. 1948.

About 10 species in Central and South America.

Type species: *Achras zapota L.* (1753).

Discussion: Gilly, 1943, when studying the genera *Achras* and *Manilkara* in America reached the conclusion that these genera had to be united. He rejects the name *Achras* L. as a nomen confusum, but it was pointed out by Little in 1948, that *Achras* L. has been correctly published and is certainly not a nomen confusum. Its first description has been given by Linnaeus in 1753 and has been emendated by Loefling, 1758. This state of affairs was confirmed by H. J. Lam c.s. in his report to be discussed at the forthcoming Paris conference on a proposal to conserve the generic name *Achras* L., 1753, against *Achras* L. emend. Loefl., 1758. This proposal was considered irrevelant.

After studying *Manilkara* (mainly Malaysian species) and *Achras zapota* L. (at Malaysian specimens only) we are convinced that Gilly is correct in concluding that *Achras* and *Manilkara* are congeneric. Since *Achras*, in his opinion, is a nomen confusum, he accepts *Manilkara* as the next available validly published name for the combined taxon. But as *Achras* proved to be a validly published name this generic name must be used for the combined taxon and not *Manilkara* as the latter is published in 1763.

Under *Achras* about 50 binomials, of which about 10 only are valid species, have been described amongst which the well known fruit tree known as *Sapodilla* (*Achras zapota* L.). Other binomials have been amalgamated with such genera as *Calocarpum* Pierre, *Planchonella* Pierre and *Sideroxylon* L.

Under *Manilkara* about 85 binomials have been described. There are about 75 recognised species in all tropical countries (about 20 in America, about 30 in Africa and about 25 in Austral-asia) many of which yield a valuable timber.

So as to avoid a considerable number of specific transfers we propose to conserve Manilkara Adanson against Achras Linnaeus, if the combination of the two genera is accepted.

Proposed by: H. J. Lam and P. van Royen, Leiden.

**Proposal no. 20**

Proposal for the conservation of the genus **Planchonella** of the Sapotaceae: *Planchonella* Pierre, Not. bot. Sapot.: 34. 1890 *versus*: *Hormogyne* A.DC., Prodr. 8: 176. 1844.

*Planchonella* Pierre, Sapotaceae.

Adopted by: Engler, Engler & Prantl, Nat. Pfl. Fam., Nachtr. 4, 1: 271. 1897; Dubard, Comptes Rend. Ac. Sc. 152: 772. 1911; idem, Ann. Mus. col. Mars. 20: 41. 1912; H. J. Lam, Bull. Jard. bot. Bzg, sér. 3, 8: 467. 1927; idem, Blumea 5, 1: 2. 1942. About 100 species in SE Asia, Malaysia, Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific area.

Type species: *Planchonella obovata* (R. Br.) Pierre (1890), based on *Sersalisia obovata* R. Brown (1810).

*Hormogyne* A.DC. Sapotaceae.

Adopted by: Engler, Engler & Prantl, Nat. Pfl. Fam. 4, 1: 145. 1897.

One species in Australia and 4 binomials which have been amalgamated with *Planchonella* (1), *Pouteria* (1) and *Sideroxylon* (2).

Type species: *Hormogyne cotinifolia* A. DC. (1844).

Discussion: Dubard in 1911 formally reduces *Hormogyne* A. DC. to a section of *Planchonella* Pierre (1890), overlooking the fact that *Hormogyne* antedates *Planchonella* with 46 years. It is evident that *Hormogyne* should be used as the name of the genus in Dubard's sense (supported by Lam), but this would necessitate more than 100 new combinations from *Planchonella* against a single new combination.

The same proposal was already made by S. T. Blake (Brisbane) in a manuscript presented to Lam some years ago. Publication of this manuscript was withheld until it had been decided whether or not *Planchonella* and *Pouteria* are congeneric. A new revision of *Planchonella* prepared by van Royen showed that this viewpoint, defended by Baehni (Candollea 9, 1942), cannot be maintained and that *Planchonella* is to be considered a separate genus. This opinion is shared by Lam.

Of *Sersalisia* originally 2 species were described by R. Brown, Prodr.: 530. 1810, viz. *S. sericea* (Ait.) R. Br. and S. obovata R. Br. The former, which is based on *Sideroxylon sericeum* Aiton, Hortus Kewensis 1: 262. 1789, is regarded as the type species of *Sersalisia*, and proves to belong to *Pouteria* Aublet (1775). The generic name *Sersalisia* thus is superfluous and as the second species is a *Planchonella* there is no need to conserve *Planchonella* against *Sersalisia*. *Sersalisia obovata* R. Br. is regarded as the type species of *Planchonella*.

To avoid a considerable number of specific transfers it is therefore proposed to conserve *Planchonella* Pierre against *Hormogyne* A. DC.

Proposed by: S. T. Blake (Brisbane), H. J. Lam and P. van Royen (Leiden).

**Proposal no. 21**

**Article 74**

*(Illegitimacy of later homonyms)*

For "a taxon of the same rank based on a different type" substitute "any taxon of the same rank".

Argument: This alteration would simplify the article by making *all* subsequent duplications of names "later homonyms". As the article now stands, "later homonyms" are defined as names that duplicate only those previously published for taxa based on *different* types; so it is not obligatory to reject a name which, in certain circumstances, may duplicate one based on the *same* type. An example of such a duplicated name, which is *not* to be considered as a later homonym, is given under Article 81, where Hutchinson, Silow and Stephens are justified in reviving the name *Gossypium sturtii;* but this liberty could bring about confusion, and it seems desirable to forbid any such practice.

With regard to the *Gossypium* question raised under **Article 81**, *viz.* whether *G. sturtianum* Willis (1947) antedates *G. sturtii* Hutchinson, Silow & Stephens (1947), there need be no doubt. The former name was published in *The Victorian Naturalist* of 8 May 1947, while inquiries at Oxford University Press disclose that *The Evolution of Gossypium etc.,* in which book the publication of *G. sturtii* was effected, did not make its appearance until 28 August 1947 — more than three months after *G. sturtianum.*

Proposed by: J. H. Willis, National Herbarium of Victoria, Australia.

**Proposal no. 22**

**Article 81**

The last sentence of the second paragraph of Examples should be completed by the following words, preceded by a comma: "and the binomial should be written *Calandrinia polyandra* Benth., not *Calandrinia polyandra* (Hook.) Benth."

Argument: This will remove all doubts as to procedure to be followed in such cases. At present many botanists do not understand this procedure, and the words "combination" and "new" in this sentence are likely to be a source of ambiguity unless these words are added.

Proposed by: N. Y. Sandwith, Kew.

**Proposal no. 23**

Add the words "or other word" to Art. 79 (3).

The provision will then read as follows:

**Article 79**

Specific and infraspecific epithets are illegitimate in the following special case and

must be rejected: (3) When they exactly repeat the generic name with or without the addition of a transcribed symbol *or other word.*

Examples (3) *Linaria Linaria, Nasturtium nasturtium-aquaticum, Melilotus melilotus-officinalis.*

Argument: Under the Code, as it stands, the eight combinations *Melilotus melilotus-caerulea* (L.). *M. melilotus-polonica* (L.), etc., which appear to be universally rejected, are the correct names for the species concerned. The addition of the words "or other word" excludes these combinations, thus treating them in the same way as the rejected name *Nasturtium nasturtium-aquaticum.*

Proposed by: Mrs M. L. Sprague.

**Proposal no. 24**

Proposal for the conservation of the genus 4449 **Trigonostemon** Blume (1825) of the Euphorbiaceae versus: 4449 *Enchidium* Jack in Malay Miscell. 2: 89. 1822.

*Trigonostemon* Blume, Bijdr. part 12: 600. 1825 *(Trigonostemon);* Fl. Jav. praef. viii. 1828. *(Trigonostemon).* Euphorbiaceae.

Type species: *Trigonostemon serratus* Blume, l.c.

Size and area: About 80 binomials listed, SE. Asia, China, and Malaysia.

Recognition: Accepted as the correct name in all works.

*Enchidium* Jack, in Malay Miscell. 2: 89. 1822.

Type species: *Enchidium verticillatum* Jack, l.c.

Size, area and recognition: Monotypic, Sumatra, by routine inserted as a genus of doubtful status in compilation works but no longer entered since the moment it was found to be congeneric with Trigonostemon.

Discussion: The identity of Jack's plant remained obscure for a long time. Apparently J. D. Hooker (Fl. Br. Ind. 5: 398. 1887) was the first to reduce it to *Trigonostemon* though there neither Jack's generic name nor the specific epithet were taken up. Jackson was well aware of its priority over *Trigonostemon,* adding after the name Enchidium: "nomen prius" (Ind. Kew. 2: 1118). However, he also did not take action; neither did any other author after him, including the monographer Pax who transferred Jack's species to *Trigonostemon* (Pflanzenreich Heft 47: 87. 1911). Jack's name has remained obsolete for over a century.

Therefore, taking into consideration the wide use of Trigonostemon in botanical and forestry literature, it was proposed by Van Steenis (Fl. Mal. Bull. no. 3: 74. 1948) to conserve the generic name *Trigonostemon.* In view of the large number of new combinations necessary for reinstating Jack's generic name, it seems reasonable to suppress it as a nomen rejiciendum. This proposal was supported by Merrill (Journ. Arn. Arb. 33: 224. 1952).

Recommendation: It is recommended to conserve *Trigonostemon* over *Enchidium* Jack.

Proposed by: C. G. G. J. van Steenis.

**Proposal no. 25**

Proposal to conserve the genus 4578 **Campnosperma** Thwaites (1854) of the Anacardiaceae versus: 9680 *Coelopyrum* Jack (1822).

*Campnosperma* Thwaites, in Hooker, Kew Journ. 6: 65 t. 1. 1854. Anacardiaceae.

Type species: *Campnosperma zeylanica* Thwaites, l.c.

Size and area: About 20 species, from the Mascarenes through SE. Asia, and Malaysia, to the Solomons.

Recognition: Unanimously adopted as the correct name in botanical literature, also posterior to the discovery of its being congeneric with *Coelopyrum.*

*Coelopyrum* Jack, in Malay Miscell. 2: 65. 1822.

Type species: *Coelopyrum coriaceum* Jack, l.c.

Size and area: Monotypic, Sumatra.

Recognition: By routine inserted in various reference works, recognized only in 1921, never taken up.

Discussion: The identity of Jack's genus remained obscure until 1921 when Hallier f. recognized it as congeneric with *Campnosperma* (Beih. Bot. Centralbl. 39 II: 161. 1921). Until then it had been inserted in reference works, mostly as incertae sedis. Hallier's identification has been corroborated by various authors. As a reinstatement of Jack's generic name would mean the suppression of a very well-known generic name, widely used in botanical and forestry literature, and would necessitate about twenty new combinations it was proposed by Van Steenis (Fl. Mal. Bull. no. 3: 74. 1948) to conserve *Campnosperma* over

*Coelopyrum*. Dr Merrill supports this proposal (Journ. Arn. Arb. 33: 221. 1952).

Recommendation: It is proposed to conserve *Campnosperma* over *Coelopyrum* Jack.

Proposed by: C. G. G. J. van Steenis.

**Proposal no. 26**

Proposal to conserve the genus 5150 **Schima** Reinw. ex Blume (1825) of the Theaceae versus: *Schima* Reinw. ex Blume (1823).

*Schima* Reinw. ex Blume, Bijdr. Fl. Ned. Ind. part 3: 129. 1825. Theaceae.

Type species: *Schima noronhae* Reinw. ex Bl., l.c.

*Schima* Reinw. ex Blume, Cat. Gew. Buitenz. 80. 1823.

Type species: *Schima excelsa* Bl., l.c.

Discussion: In a recent monograph of *Schima* by Bloembergen (Reinwardtia 2: 135, 178. 1952) it is stated erroneously that both *Schima* Reinw. ex Bl. (1823) and its type *Schima excelsa* Bl. (1823) are nomina nuda. The genus was in 1823 not introduced by a generic description; it contained one specific name *Sch. noronhae* R(einw. ex Blume) without a description (which has thus no status), and one with a description viz. *Sch. excelsa* Bl. The latter description thus became a descriptio generico-specifica with the type *Sch. excelsa* Bl. as its sole basis. In 1825 Blume had found out that he had wrongly borrowed from Reinwardt and corrected himself, in giving a new full generic and specific description of *Schima* and its new type *Schima noronhae* (l.c. 129-130), simultaneously reducing *Schima excelsa* (rightly) to another Theaceous genus *Gordonia* Ellis (1770) (l.c. 130-131). By this removal of the type of *Schima* Reinw. ex Bl. (1823) this generic name became automatically a synonym of *Gordonia* Ellis, at the same time making the generic name *Schima* Reinw. ex Bl. (1825) a later homonym, which under Art. 74 must be rejected.

As Blume's correction was immediately taken up by all subsequent authors and has always been recognized in its 1825-sense and has never given rise to any confusion, it seems necessary to legitimize formally its use.

Recommendation: to conserve *Schima* Reinw. ex Bl. (1825) over *Schima* Reinw. ex Bl. (1823).

Proposed by: C. G. G. J. van Steenis.

---

## *News from the Herbaria*

### PERSONALIA

Dr Jacob P. Anderson, foremost student of the flora of Alaska, passed away at Rochester, Minnesota, February 15, 1953, at the age of 79 years. Dr Anderson resided in Alaska approximately 30 years, devoting a large portion of his time to collections and studies leading to the preparation of the complete flora of that territory. His flora has appeared serially in ten parts in the Iowa State College Journal of Science. At the time of his untimely death, he was concerned with revisions of his earlier studies preparatory to issuing the flora in book form. A detailed memorial notice will appear in the Proceedings of the Iowa Academy of Science.

### NEW JOURNAL

***Lichenological Miscellanies.***

Lichenological Miscellanies, a Japanese leaflet which began its life in 1951 under the name of Lichenological Notes, is now being issued quarterly. Editor is Prof. Masami Sato, Faculty of Agriculture, Yamagata University, Tsuruoka, Japan. L.M. deals with news of local and general interest, indigenous species and personal data, whereas it also announces local and foreign literature. The table of contents, in English language, gives a clue of what the Japanese text is about.

### BOTANISCHE JAHRBÜCHER

Die Herausgabe der von A. Engler gegründeten „Botanischen Jahrbücher für Systematik, Pflanzengeschichte und Pflanzengeographie" sowie der „Bibliotheca Botanica" (Verlag E. Schweizerbart, Stuttgart) hat nach dem Ableben von R. Pilger der Unterzeichnete übernommen. Das erste Heft von Band 76 der „Jahrbücher" erscheint demnächst, das zweite Heft befindet sich im Druck.

Manuskripte systematischen, morphologischen, pflanzengeographischen und phylogenetischen Inhaltes — auch in englischer und französischer Sprache — sind einzureichen an:

Prof. Dr H. Melchior
Botanisches Museum, Berlin-Dahlem
Königin Luise-Str. 6-8

### *Office*

The International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, 106 Lange Nieuwstraat, Utrecht — Netherlands.

### *Membership Fees*

Members are requested to pay their membership fees to the regional treasurers.

Members in countries without regional treasurers are requested to make payable their subscriptions to *Messrs Vlaer & Kol, Utrecht, Netherlands,* crossed: *"a.c. International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy".*

| A. Individual Persons | $ | £ | D.fl. | Sw.Kr. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Regular Members | 3.— | 1.1.— | 11.40 | 15.90 |
| Associate Members | 1.— | —.7.— | 3.80 | 5.30 |
| **B. Institutes, Societies, etc.** | | | | |
| Supporting Members | 50.— | 17.10.— | 190.— | 265.— |
| Regular Members | 25.— | 8.15.— | 95.— | 132.50 |
| Associate Members | 10.— | 3.10.— | 38.— | 53.— |

Payments can be made in any currency; remittances in other currencies than those listed above are accepted against the exchange rates of the day of payment.

### *Regnum Vegetabile*

Vol. III. *International Code of Botanical Nomenclature,* prepared by the Editorial Committee; 228 pages; 16 × 25 cm; 15 October 1952.

*Non-Members:* Dfl. 14.— (buckram Dfl. 15.90)

*Members* (Members are entitled to receive *one* copy against a reduced price):

| A. Institutes, Societies, etc. | $ | £ | D.fl. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Supporting and Regular Members (buckram) | — | — | — |
| Associate Members | 2.— | —.14.6 | 7.60 |
| buckram | 2.50 | —.18.— | 9.50 |
| **B. Individual Members** | | | |
| Regular Members | 2.— | —.14.6 | 7.60 |
| buckram | 2.50 | —.18.— | 9.50 |
| Associate Members | 2.80 | 1.—.— | 10.60 |
| buckram | 3.30 | 1. 4.— | 12.50 |
| **C. Extra copies Members** | | | |
| stitched | 3.70 | 1. 6.6 | 14.00 |
| buckram | 4.20 | 1.10.— | 15.90 |

### TAXON

Volume I, nos. 1—9, 1951—52. Backnumbers (no. 3 excepted) are available for all members wanting to complete their possibly incomplete copies. Members who joined the I.A.P.T. on or after 1 January 1953 can buy the complete volume I against $ 3.— per copy.

### REGIONAL TREASURERS

*Austria:* Dr K. H. Rechinger, Naturhistorisches Museum, Botanische Abteilung, Burgring 7, Wien.

*Belgium:* Prof. W. Robyns, Rijksplantentuin, 236 Koninklijke Straat, Brussel.

*Canada:* Prof. J. Rousseau, Montreal Botanical Garden, 4101 Sherbrooke Street East, Montreal, Que.

*Egypt:* Mr Mohammed Drar, Fouad I Agricultural Museum, Dokki, Cairo.

*Germany:* Dr Walter Domke, Staatsinstitut für Allgemeine Botanik, Jungiusstrasse 6, Hamburg 36.

*Great Britain and British Overseas Territories:* Mr A. A. Bullock, The Herbarium, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, Surrey, England.

*Italy:* Prof. R. E. G. Pichi Sermolli, Herbarium Universitatis Florentinae, Istituto Botanico dell'Universitá, Via Lamarmora no. 4, Firenze.

*Netherlands:* The International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, Lange Nieuwstraat 106, Utrecht. Bankers: Messrs Vlaer & Kol, Utrecht, giro 7247.

*Norway:* Prof. K. Faegri, Universitet I Bergen, Botanisk Museum, Bergen.

*Sweden:* Mr Bo Peterson, Botaniska Museet, Lund. Postgiro 43.35.39.

*U.S.A.:* Dr R. C. Rollins, Gray Herbarium, Harvard University, 79 Garden Street, Cambridge 38, Mass.

---

*"Taxon" is directed by: Prof. J. Lanjouw, Chief Editor, and Dr F. A. Stafleu, Assistant Editor. All correspondence should be sent to the International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, 106 Lange Nieuwstraat, Utrecht — Netherlands.*
*All members of I.A.P.T. receive "Taxon" free of charge. Copies of personal members are for private use only and should not be placed in official libraries.*